UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,520	02/13/2002	Duncan Kerr	APL1P218	8920

22434 7590 04/21/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, KEVIN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	9

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/075,520	KERR, DUNCAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/12/02,01/21/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 20, 22-26, 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Laurikka et al (US 6,608,996).

2. As to claims 20, 32, Laurikka teaches a display device associated with a method, the display device comprising

The display 9, keyboard 11, and/or antenna 12 of the wireless communication device 7 can be arranged to change colour by producing the part from a material which changes colour under the effect of an electric or electromagnetic control signal. The display, the keyboard and/or the antenna can be arranged to change colour by means of the control signal in a similar way as presented in connection with the colour change of the cover. The colour can be changed for example when a call or a text message arrives, when the state of charge of the battery is weak, or when the user sets the colour on the display to a different one by means of the menu of the wireless communication device (col. 6, lines 1-12).

As to claims 22-26 Laurikka teaches a battery indicator and the signal indicator in the screen 9 adjacent two light element of the casing 1 (see fig. 3).

As to claims 28-30, 33, Laurikka teaches the computer device is a general purpose computer (col. 6, lines 47-48).

As to claim 31, Laurikka teaches a mobile phone (see fig. 3, col. 4, line 44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurikka et al in view of Bayramoglu et al.

As to claim 21, Laurikka teaches all of the claimed limitations, except for said illuminating operates to drive the light elements recited in claim 21.

However, Bayramoglu teaches a plurality of light emitting diodes (fig. 2, col. 4, line 46), a light controller (the USB hub/peripheral controller 300, fig. 4) drives the light elements.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laurikka's light elements including a USB hub/peripheral controller 300, in view of the teaching in the Bayramoglu's reference because this would provide a sustain a blinking LED even while the base system is in a sleep mode as taught by Bayramoglu (abstract, 4 last line).

As to claim 27, Bayramoglu teaches colored light emitting diodes (fig. 2).

4. Claims 1-19, 34-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayramoglu et al (US 6,289,466) in view of Laurikka et al.

5. As to claims 1, 10, Bayramoglu teaches a computer system (fig. 1) associated with a method, the computer system comprising

a microprocessor (a processor 100, fig. 1), a data storage device (a memory 112, fig. 1);

light system (LEDs are on the font bezel indicate monitor and base system power status (abstract, 2 last lines), a dynamic light effect based on the monitored events (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 35-53);

a computer case (base system B, fig. 1) is a housing containing the microprocessor 100, the memory 112 (fig. 1);

a monitor 102 (fig.1) comprises a housing (a bezel 206 containing the light system, fig. 2);

Accordingly, Bayramoglu teaches all of the claimed limitations, except for the light system provides said housing with a dynamic ornamental appearance.

However, Laurikka teaches a cover composing a light system (fig. 3) can function as an indicator with indicates a particular change by changing the colour or the pattern 8 of the cover 1 (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 55-58).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bayramoglu's housing including an indicator with indicates a particular change by changing the colour or the pattern 8, in view of the

teaching in the Laurikka's reference because this would provide the user wishes to change/ decorate the outer appearance of his/her electronic device as taught by Laurikka (col. 1, lines 8-9).

As to claims 2, 13, Laurikka teaches multi-colored (different colours, col. 2, line 42).

As to claim 3, 19, Bayramoglu teaches a desktop computer system (fig. 1).

As to claims 4, 5, Bayramoglu teaches a light emitting diodes 210, 214 (fig. 4), a light controller (UBS HUB/peripheral controller 300, fig. 4).

As to claims 6, 15, Laurikka teaches a cover 1 is transparent (col. 3, line 6).

As to claims 7-9, 14, 16-18, Bayramoglu teaches computer status conditions (see col. 6, lines 35-53).

As to claims 11, 12, Laurikaa et al teaches besides indicating that a call or a text message is arriving/has arrived, the change of the colour or pattern of the cover can also indicate the state of the device and the mobile communication network. By changing the colour or pattern of the cover, it is possible to give an alarm, a warning or a message for the user of the state of the device or the mobile communication network, for example by changing the colour of the cover, it is possible to warn the user that the charge of the battery is weak, report a weak signal strength, or give an alarm in case of a failure (col. 4, lines 58-67). Thus, the teaching of Laurikka meets the claimed limitations "a dynamic light effect and a dynamic ornamental appearance."

6. As to claim 34, 39, Laurikka teaches a display device associated with a method, the display device comprising

The display 9, keyboard 11, and/or antenna 12 of the wireless communication device 7 can be arranged to change colour by producing the part from a material which changes colour under the effect of an electric or electromagnetic control signal. The display, the keyboard and/or the antenna can be arranged to change colour by means of the control signal in a similar way as presented in connection with the colour change of the cover. The colour can be changed for example when a call or a text message arrives, when the state of charge of the battery is weak, or when the user sets the colour on the display to a different one by means of the menu of the wireless communication device (col. 6, lines 1-12).

Laurikka teaches all of the claimed limitations, except for driving at least one light element recited in claim 34.

However, Bayramoglu teaches a plurality of light emitting diodes (fig. 2, col. 4, line 46), a light controller (the USB hub/peripheral controller 300, fig. 4) drives the light elements.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Laurikka's light elements including a USB hub/peripheral controller 300, in view of the teaching in the Bayramoglu's reference because this would provide a sustain a blinking LED even while the base system is in a sleep mode as taught by Bayramoglu (abstract, 4 last line).

As to claim 35, Laurikka teaches a casing 1 (fig. 3) comprising inherently a processor (col. 8, line 32), a memory (col. 5, line 35), inherently an input/out ports.

As to claim 36, Laurikka teaches a battery indicator and the signal indicator in the screen 9 adjacent two light element of the casing 1 (see fig. 3).

As to claim 37, 38, 41, Laurikka teaches the computer device is a general purpose computer (col. 6, lines 47-48).

As to claim 40, Bayramoglu teaches colored light emitting diodes (fig. 2).

As to claim 42, Laurikka teaches the user can switch on such a coloured cover indicator function from the menu of the wireless communication device, wherein the colour of the cover 1 of the wireless communication device is changed when a call or a text message arrives (col. 3, lines 28-32).

7. As to claim 43, Bayramoglu teaches a computer system comprising

an event monitor (a monitor microprocessor controller 302, fig. 3);

a light effect manager (USB HUB/peripheral controller 300, fig. 3);

a light arrangement (a bezel 206 containing the light system, fig. 2 and fig. 3);

Accordingly, Bayramoglu teaches all of the claimed limitations, except for illuminable housing with a dynamic ornamental appearance.

However, Laurikka teaches a cover composing a light system (fig. 3) can function as an indicator with indicates a particular change by changing the colour or the pattern 8 of the cover 1 (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 55-58).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bayramoglu's housing including an indicator with indicates a particular change by changing the colour or the pattern 8, in view of the teaching in the Laurikka's reference because this would provide the user wishes to

change/ decorate the outer appearance of his/her electronic device as taught by Laurikka (col. 1, lines 8-9).

As to claim 44, Bayramoglu teaches a monitor microprocessor controller 302, fig. 3).

As to claim 45, Bayramoglu teaches a computer system which includes an operating system.

As to claim 46, Bayramoglu teaches said computer event is one of input data (data and clock input from I^2C 310, fig. 4).

As to claim 47, Laurikka teaches a cover composing a light system (fig. 3) can function as an indicator with indicates a particular change by changing the colour or the pattern 8 of the cover 1 (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 55-58).

As to claim 48, Laurikka teaches a light system (fig. 3) that produce the desired light effect (the lights flash when the text message or a call have arrived, fig. 3, col. 4, lines 1-3).

8. Claims 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayramoglu et al in view of Laurikka et al, and further in view of McDonough et al (US 6,486,873).

As to claims 49-54, Bayramoglu and Laurikka teach all of the claimed limitations, except for a peripheral device is illuminated housing.

However, McDonough teaches a mouse is illuminated housing (fig. 1, col. 5, lines 1-4).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide Bayramoglu's computer system including the mouse is illuminated housing, in view of the teaching in McDonough's reference because this would provide a user more efficiently and accurately locate the device during reduced lighting condition or no light conditions as taught by McDonough (col. 2, lines 38-40).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kevin M. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-6209**. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reached on **703-305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Kevin M. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2674

KN
April 14, 2004

XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER